



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,393	10/07/2005	Brian Hulse	GB920030001US1	4761
35525	7590	04/30/2008		
IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER NISSAN, BARAK	
			ART UNIT 2142	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/30/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/552,393	Applicant(s) HULSE ET AL.	
	Examiner BARAK NISSAN	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's reply filed under 37 CFR 1.111 on 2/26/2008. Claim 1 has been amended, claims 5-9 have been cancelled and Claims 1-4 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatapathy C et al. ["An Introduction to Web Services Gateway", May 2002] (referred to Venkatapathy hereafter) in view of Chan ["Web services sub-team report", June 2002].

4. Regarding claim 1, Venkatapathy teaches a method for a web services gateway to enable a web client to access a web service (i.e. web services can be accessed from applications and processes both within the corporate firewall and enables a external user to access to the service, page 1 lines 6-10, page 2 lines 9-11, and lines 30-36), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a profile from the web service, the profile containing details of how to communicate with the web service (e.g. provided a StockQuote service that is deployed inside the firewall of your enterprise and sharing the services with the clients, page 2 lines 38-43 and

page 3 lines 1-3);

creating a document based on the profile (e.g. importing the WSDL document into the gateway), the document being in a format recognizable to the web client and containing details of how to communicate with the web service via the gateway (i.e. the gateway will generate a new WSDL file that can be shared with the clients, page 3 lines 1-6); and

providing, to a third party (e.g. UDDI directory), information relating to the web service and a location from which the document can be obtained by the web client (i.e. sharing the WSDL document to requesters outside the firewall, page 4 lines 1-4);

thereby enabling the web client to use the document to access the web service via the web service gateway (see page 4 lines 1-10, Fig. 1).

However, Venkatapathy does not teach where the profile containing the details of how to communicate is **in a format not recognizable to the web client**.

Chan, on the other hand, teaches a system in which the a profile containing the details of how to communicate can be formatted in other ways if it is not recognizable to the client by mapping CPA files (the profile definition in ebXML standards) into WSDL files (see pages 2, 3, 8-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the method in view of Venkatapathy teachings to include being in a format not recognizable to the web client taught by Chan. One ordinary skilled in the art wanting to publish a service using the gateway would look for ways to transform web service profiles from one definition to the other. One would be motivated to combine these teachings because there is a sufficient information in the CPA to generate WSDL definitions for all the

parties involved.

5. Regarding claim 2, the combination of Venkatapathy in view of Chan teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See the rejection of claim 1 above.

Venkatapathy further teaches:

receiving a request from the web client for the web service, the request including details of the document (i.e. requesting the WSDL document to requestors from the gateway web service, page 4 lines 1-6);

using the details of the document to match the request with the profile received from the web service and using details from the profile to convert the request to a request suitable for sending to the web service (e.g. specifying in the gateway that the service will be accessed by SOAP over HTTP and the gateway will generate the new WSDL to share to the clients, i.e. Fig, 3 shows the flow of inbound requests that gets transformed to SOAP/JMS invocation in order to access the StockQuote services, page 5 lines 1-7); and

sending the converted request to the web service (i.e. sending the converted request to the web services gateway, page 5 Fig. 3).

6. Regarding claim 3, the combination of Venkatapathy in view of Chan teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See the rejection of claim 1 above.

Venkatapathy further teaches:

receiving a request, at the location, from the web client for the web service (i.e. receiving the request at a SOAP address location from the web client for the web services, Listing 1 [StockQuote SOAP service WSDL], Listing 2 [Gateway StockQuote service implementation

WSDL], Fig. 3);

obtaining details from the profile associated with the location and using the details to convert the request into a request suitable for sending to the web service; and sending the converted request to the web service (i.e. the details from the WSDL profile is associated with the SOAP address location and transforming the request for sending to the web service using SOAP/JMS as shown in Fig.3, pages 4 lines 1-6, page 5 lines 1-7).

7. Regarding claim 4, the combination of Venkatapathy in view of Chan teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See the rejection of claim 2 above.

Venkatapathy further teaches:

waiting for a response to the converted request from the web service; and using the response to the converted request to trigger a response to the web client request (see page 2 lines 30-36, page 4 line 8 - page 5 line 12, Fig. 2-4).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 2/26/2008, with respect to the rejections of claim(s) 1-9 under 103(a) have been considered and persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Venkatapathy regarding the independent claim 1 with reference Chan.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BARAK NISSAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3632. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)-272-3836. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Barak Nissan
Patent Examiner

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142